

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 106-120 remain pending in the application.

**35 USC 112, 1<sup>st</sup> Para. rejection of Claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 106-108**

Claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 106-108 were rejected under 35 USC 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. These claims have been carefully reviewed and are amended appropriately herein to be more definite.

Claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 106-108 are now in full conformance with 35 USC 112. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 & 109-120 over Greer and in view of Official Notice**

In the Office Action, claims 1-7, 9, 10, 14, 33-38, 40, 41, 45, 58-65, 67, 68, 72, 106-111, 113-115 and 117-119 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,247,048 to Greer et al. ("Greer"); and claims 8, 11-13, 15, 39, 42-44, 46, 66, 69-71, 73, 112, 116 and 120 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Greer in view of Official Notice. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 1-15 and 58-73 recite site-mining at a proxy server desired content from a web page, and transmitting to a mobile device the site-mined desired content using a secure connection. Claims 33-46 recite a proxy server that receives a user request, forwards a request to an origin web server, receives a requested web page having a first format from said origin web server, and site-mines and reformats at least a portion of the content from the web page having the first format, for transmission to the at least one mobile transmission device, in accordance with a limitation associated with the mobile device the content is viewable on. Claims 109-120 recite site-mining a subset of content requested by a mobile device from a proxy server, and converting the site-mined subset of content based on mobile device related information.

Thus, all pending claims are amended herein to emphasize that a requested web page is **SITE-MINED**, and converted for display on a mobile device.

The Examiner cites Greer as a base reference. Greer teaches transcoding of a character set, and then formatting into a response for a mobile computing device. (See Greer, col. 7, lines 20-23) Greer, quite simply, fails to disclose, teach or suggest **site-mining** for ANY reason, much less **site-mining for display on a mobile device** as variously claimed by claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 109-120.

The Examiner takes Official Notice of "both the concept and advantages of providing for defining the mobile device by the manufacturer and model". (Office Action at 8) Even if this is proper, it does not cure the serious deficiency lacking in Greer, i.e., the use of **site-mining** as claimed.

For these and other reasons, claims 1-15, 33-46, 58-73 and 109-120 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

#### **Claims 106-108 over Greer in view of Knutson**

Claims 106-108 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Greer in view of U.S. Pat. Publ. No. 2002/0087416 to Knutson ("Knutson"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 106-108 recite **site-mining desired** content from a web page source, and reformatting the site-mined desired content in accordance with a limitation associated with a mobile device the site-mined desired content is viewable on. Thus, claims 106-108 all require site-mining desired content from a web page, and reformatting of the site-mined desired content in accordance with a limitation associated with a mobile device.

As discussed above, Greer fails to disclose, teach or suggest site-mining at all, much less site-mining and reformatting in accordance with a limitation associated with a mobile device that the site-mined desired content is

to be viewed on. With respect to this particular rejection, the Examiner cites Knutson as allegedly curing the serious deficiencies in Greer.

In particular, the Examiner cites paragraph 19 of Knutson for allegedly teaching "the step of filtering the web page content in accordance with a limitation associated with the mobile device the web page content is viewable on. Paragraph 19 of Knutson is reproduced below for convenience:

A central system in communication with the Internet provides a platform that generates content from existing content on the Internet, filters the gathered content appropriately, classifies the filtered educational content, reformats the educational content appropriately if necessary (i.e. in accordance with a user's profile). Reformatting preferably utilizes a user-specific hardware profile methodology and/or a user-specific profile methodology. The central system is built with object-oriented technology. Particularly, the central system consists of an object model. The various portions of the object model provide parameters for the various functions of the system. The content is preferably stored in an object-oriented manner in accordance and in conjunction with the object model. The object model is utilized to provide the appropriate content to a user in accordance with the user's learning profile and/or level with a learning chain of a learning plan, along with a user's hardware profile.

Whatever Knutson is teaching in paragraph 19, it is certainly **not site-mining**, much less **site-mining based on a limitation** associated with a mobile device the site-mined content is to be viewed on.

Accordingly, even Greer in view of Knutson fail to disclose, teach or suggest site-mining desired content from a web page, and reformatting of the site-mined desired content in accordance with a limitation associated with a mobile device, as claimed by claims 106-108.

Claims 106-108 are patentable for at least these reasons. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

William H. Bollman  
Reg. No.: 36,457  
Tel. (202) 261-1020  
Fax. (202) 887-0336

**MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC**  
2000 M Street, N.W. 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington D.C. 20036-3307